

## CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

## Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, April 6, 1989

Present: C. Bertrand, Chair; B. Spanos; E. Gardham; J. Appleby; R. Pallen; D. Dicks; S. Ruby; D. Acland; R. McDonald; E. Preston; W. Gilsdorf; R. Schmid; G. Auchinachie; R. Kilgour; C. Levy; M. Barlow; G. Decarie; R. Perigoe; I. Irvine; W. Byers; C. Gray; S. Dubas; C. White; M. Oppenheim; J. Drysdale; S. Hoecker-Drysdale; M. Giguere; J. Ryan; G. Trudel; C. Davis; M. Szabo; M. Dionne; E. Budik; S. O'Hara; E. Mourillon; M. Sullivan; M. Moser; J. Brown; S. Maguire; S. Letovsky; H. McLachlan; F. Fazio; B. Leonhardt.

Regrets: G. Valaskakis; B. Barkman; G. Szamosi; H. DeRomer; B. Jenkins.

Absent: H. McQueen; P. Widden; Z. Hamlet; C. Barton; D. Salee; W. Hooper; H. Shulman; D. Shapiro; R. Seppanen; Y-L. Khoury; N. deGraff; R. Gossen; J. Bara.

Guest: J. Fiset.

Documents considered and distributed at the meeting

ASFC 89-3M-A Notice of election for Arts and Science Faculty Committees

ASFC 89-3M-B Graduate Grading System

ASFC 89-3M-C \$100.00 fine for submitting work-term reports late, charged to students of the Institute for Co-operative Education

ASFC 89-3M-D Re-admission of "super-failed" students

ASFC 89-3M-E Proposed Policy on Copyright Compliance

ASFC 89-3M-F Library Acquisitions Budget

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1336.

2. Approval of Agenda

89-3-1 It was moved and seconded (Fazio/Trudel) that the Agenda be approved.

Sullivan requested that Item 8 be moved under Item 11 on the Agenda. The Dean agreed.

CARRIED (as amended)

3. Approval of Minutes of March 10, 1989

89-3-2

It was moved and seconded (Oppenheim/Levy) that the minutes of March 10, 1989, be approved.

Trudel requested that his name be listed under Regrets for the meeting of March 10, 1989.

CARRIED (as amended)

4. Remarks from the Chair

The Dean apologized for scheduling this meeting on a Thursday. The change was necessitated by the Friday Senate meeting.

As a follow-up to an issue raised previously, the Dean stated that the Steering Committee had communicated with the Registrar's Office and the Computer Centre regarding the possibility of listing not only the students' names but also their departments in the Convocation Booklet. As there are some technical difficulties involved, the Registrar's Office will advise Council in November whether this will be possible.

The Dean stated that there were two possible solutions to address the issue raised by Fazio at the last ASFC meeting, regarding the 1445 and 1605 time slots. The first would be to change the 1445 time slot to 1440; the other would be to strictly enforce the rule that the 1605 time slot be reserved exclusively for graduate level courses. Council may wish to consider this item under Other Business.

5. Questions and Announcements

Fazio asked Council to officially congratulate the new CUSA Co-Presidents, Melodie Ann Sullivan and Shawn O'Hara, who took office April 1.

6. Notice of election for Arts and Science Faculty Committees

The Dean referred Council members to Document ASFC 89-3M-A and asked that nominations be submitted to the Office of the Dean by Friday, April 28, 1989. Faculty members will be elected and student representatives will be ratified at the May 12 meeting.

7. Proposed Graduate Grading System

89-3M-3

It was moved and seconded (Drysdale/O'Hara) that the Arts and Science Faculty Council endorse the proposed change of the Graduate Grading System (Document ASFC 89-2M-E, BGS-889-d D2).

Drysdale stated that this item had been considered at the meeting of Chairs, Principals and Directors and was approved without dissent. The Dean informed Council that he had also received several letters from Chairs indicating that their departments endorsed the change.

Vote:	In favour	33
	Opposed	2
	Abstentions	2

CARRIED

9. Re-admission of "super-failed" students

Decarie stated that he had originally raised this matter because the rule of not permitting a "super-failed" student to apply for re-admission for a three-year period was being administered rigidly, without there being a clear rationale for the practice. The letter from the Acting Registrar stated that there was no authority for the rule, there existed no written regulation nor a clear rationale. Students in this category are arbitrarily advised that they cannot return to Concordia for three years; there appears to be no logical reason for doing this.

In response to a request for the definition of a "super failed" student, Vice-Dean Ruby explained that a super failed student was a student who had failed courses after having been readmitted on probation with the condition that they have to complete thirty credits without an additional failure. These failure regulations can be found in the Calendar.

The Dean added that the Acting Registrar's letter stated that the practice was that students who had such a notation on their record would only be reconsidered for readmission if they had been out of University for three or four years. It appears that what started as an ad hoc arrangement has now become rigid practice. It seems that Senate never passed this rule, but was informed of the practice by the Registrar's Office.

Vice-Dean Dicks pointed out that the G.P.A. of 1.5 will, as of June 1, 1989, be the new failure regulation.

Decarie wondered why a three year period had been chosen.

It was also questioned whether these students are readmitted to the program in which they had failed or did they have to apply to another program.

Vice-Dean Ruby explained that students were asked for their first and second choices, but there was no guarantee that they would be accepted to their first choice. Often even new students do not get accepted to their first choice.

Oppenheim commented that this was an important and complex issue and suggested that it be referred to the Steering Committee to discuss the issues, the difficulties, and perhaps present Council with a motion at a future meeting.

Dicks reminded Council that when the Arts and Science Faculty placed the failure regulations in the Calendar, they had been left vague deliberately so that the Faculty would have the discretion to decide when to readmit students in the failed categories.

Decarie stressed the fact that Senate had not provided rules for the Registrar's

Office to follow and that Faculties had not been consulted; therefore, this matter should be questioned and discussed further. He agreed that it would be best for the ASFC Steering Committee to further consider the issue.

10. Proposed Policy on Copyright Compliance

The Dean explained that the Steering Committee had difficulty in determining how Council would structure a debate on this policy, and it was therefore decided that it would be more productive if Council were to move that Senate establish a Task Force to affect the second phase of the legislation.

89-3M-4

It was moved and seconded (O'Hara/Drysdale) that the Arts and Science Faculty Council recommends that Senate establish a task force to examine ways of affecting Phase II of the legislation more favourably.

CARRIED (unanimously)

11. Library Acquisitions Budget

Gilsdorf informed Council that the Steering Committee was concerned about the ways in which the library acquisitions budget is allocated. He stated that Council had developed a planning document; however this document was not reflected in the Library Budget allocations, particularly when a portion of the budget is determined by a usage factor.

The Dean added that neither the Deans nor the Department Chairs have been involved in budget decisions of the Library. There should be some involvement so that the Library realizes that the Faculty is developing new graduate programs which means a need for new library acquisitions.

Appleby pointed out that a Library representative is a member of Council, and Selections Librarians get involved at the departmental level where proposals are first generated, so that they can inform the Collections Coordinator of Faculty developments.

Byers also stated that he would like Chairs to have more input. He is not satisfied with the way decisions are made and the way the budgets are allocated. When representations have been made to the Library in the past, departments have been told that there are maximum-minimum factors, and that while they may feel they are not being treated fairly, the formula indicates that they are. Chairs should have more direct academic input in terms of setting priorities. He was particularly concerned about the issue of the allocations being determined by usage.

Auchinachie spoke on behalf of existing graduate programs which are evaluated regularly. The English Department had been told that their Library acquisitions were perilously close to being inadequate for an MA program. He wondered whether this information is transmitted by Dean Szabo to the Library.

Szabo responded that Graduate Studies does make representations, and tries to coordinate various recommendations in the Appraisal Reports. At the same time they inform Librarians about development plans. He felt that Council's



discussion was very germane to what really needs to be done. Pressure needs to be applied at various levels including SCAPP. Council should look for opportunities to use global planning.

The Dean pointed out that there was no Library representative on SCAPP and both the Computer Centre and the Library should be involved.

Auchinachie reminded Council that it was at his insistence that Mate and Cohen had come to Council last fall. It was understood when user-drivenness was instituted, that departments would be provided with interim reports so that its effect on a department's library budget could be compared to the old formula which was based on the number of students. While the English Department has a large number of students, it finds itself with an increasingly shrinking library budget due to the new user-drivenness formula. It was suggested that those who had instituted this new system should come to Council and defend it, and demonstrate which departments had been disadvantaged and which ones had been advantaged; however this did not occur. Council should have demanded quarterly reports. A library acquisitions budget should be balanced against the number of faculty, the research, and the students.

Gilsdorf commented that despite the very active efforts of an excellent selections librarian in the year in which Communications Studies had launched a joint PhD program their Library budget had been cut by two thousand dollars. Cohen's response to the department's complaint had been to get the students to take books off the shelves in October and March, because that was when the user surveys were done. The Library acquisitions budget should be related to the plans of this Council and based on the Faculty's development.

Moser felt that it was dangerous to assume that students only take out books in their own fields.

Appleby responded that this was why Cohen had moved away from the number of students system. Council should support an increase in the library budget allocation regardless of how the money is divided. The allocation process is problematic and no one in the library would deny that. It would be valid for the Faculty to apply pressure on the Library to reexamine the allocation formula and introduce one which would be more equitable.

Ryan asked how much authority Council had on Library policy. He wondered, for instance if Council were to request that the Library drop the user-drivenness formula whether such a request would have any effect on the Library.

Appleby responded that it would have to be seriously considered, as well as responded to.

Oppenheim agreed that the present system gave no support to graduate programs. He agreed that the issue was not simply a matter of giving more money to the Library in general, but that there had to be an examination of a coherent policy of budgeting so that graduate studies are adequately funded.

Leonhardt added that the user-driven formula also did not take into account

inter-Library loans.

The Dean reassured Appleby that this discussion was taking place in a spirit of cooperation with her as a Council member, and he appreciated her patience.

The Dean added that he would respond to Misra's memorandum, with copies to those indicated on the memo, and to Al Mate stating that Arts and Science wants more money for the Library, but tie it to the condition that the current funding formula must be reexamined, and not just within the Library. He suggested that perhaps the five Deans, the Vice-Rector, Academic, the Vice-Rector, Services, and the head of the Library could examine the present system and attempt to find a solution to this problem.

8. \$100.00 fine for submitting work-term reports late - charged to students of the Institute for Co-operative Education

89-3M-5 It was moved and seconded (Gilsdorf/O'Hara) that:

"Whereas a system of academic rewards and penalties exists within the University, and,

whereas, with the exception of fees that are solely necessary to recoup administrative costs, the Arts and Science Faculty Council does not support the principle of monetary fines or fees in lieu of or in conjunction with an academic penalty, therefore,

be it resolved that: The Arts and Science Faculty Council recommends to Senate that the policy of collecting a \$100.00 fee for late completion of work-term reports in the Institute for Co-operative Education BE RESCINDED.

Gilsdorf stated that Steering Committee had tried to reflect the discussion of the last ASFC meeting, as well as to incorporate both the principle and the specific case.

Trudel commented that the Minutes of the last ASFC meeting indicated that most of the comments were made by faculty who were not involved in Co-Op and therefore unaware of the Institute's problems. Rescinding the fine would not solve anything. The original motion was presented by the Co-op Student Association and supported by the faculty who mark the work-term reports. If a work-term report was late information would not appear on the student's transcript, and consequently affect students who start their next work term. Trudel suggested that only those of his colleagues involved in the Co-op program should vote on the issue and that others should abstain.

The Dean pointed out that he would have some difficulty with that suggestion, because each department could then ask for the same privilege when they wished to have a vote on an issue that only concerned them. This Council was the Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science and dealt with all issues concerning the Faculty, including the Institute for Co-operative Education.

Trudel stated that Vice-Rector Academic Whyte had decided that this was not an academic matter, and that is why it was handled the way it was; Co-op did not

deliberately wish to by-pass Council.

Pallen commented that students should be told that if they cannot meet the deadline they would fail their work-term. If late reports interfere with the Co-op's schedule the fine is not going to change anything.

Moser was concerned with the ethical consideration that students who could afford to pay the fine would pass while those who could not would fail.

Maguire argued that the students had not proposed a \$100.00 fine; they had suggested \$10.00 per day to a maximum of \$100.00, but this was seen as administratively impractical. He suggested that an INCOMPLETE on the student's record may solve the problem. To fail a student on a work term would be too harsh, an INCOMPLETE would be more effective. He further argued that \$100.00 is not a nominal fee. There are students who barely make it from one work-term to another, particularly if their work term is outside Montreal.

Trudel pointed out that when he had inquired about using an INCOMPLETE he had been told that it was not possible because there was no credit value attached to the work-term. He reiterated that the Co-op students did not feel that \$100.00 was too much.

Szabo felt that this was an academic matter which required an academic penalty.

Sullivan felt that it was irrelevant whether the students earned a salary during their work-term; earning a salary did not justify the imposition of a fine.

Maguire argued that, while he did not consider that it was Council's role to look for alternatives, he felt that a notation on a student's record should be sufficient.

The Dean agreed that Council's role was not to find a solution to a problem that should be resolved by the Co-op.

John Fiset was given permission to address Council. He stated that the fine for the late submission of work-term reports was originally imposed to deter students from submitting work late, and because the faculty did not want to mark reports that were late.

Gilsdorf expressed indignation over the suggestion that he should not participate in the decision making because he was not in the Co-op. He commented that the issue concerned the way in which faculty members related to students, and that the fine was a money-exchange system. The University is not a capitalist exchange system, but an institution of educators in an environment of learning. The Institute should look for academic ways of dealing with the problem.

Trudel responded with an apology and stated that he had not intended to offend anyone. Faculty were in favour of imposing a fine because once they get into mid-terms they are reluctant to devote time to these reports which do not have an academic component. 90% of the students prepare these reports during the last two of weeks of their work-term, so that their supervisors can verify them.

Auchinachie felt that the solution would be to introduce an INCOMPLETE for non-credit courses.

O'Hara asked if the motion to rescind should read "recommend to Senate to recommend to the Board of Governors...".

The Dean replied that as he understood it, this particular fee was established by the Rector and the Vice-Rectors. If Council sends this to Senate and Senate approves, it would not have to go to the Board, because it had not gone to the Board originally.

Vote:	In favour	30
	Opposed	1
	Abstentions	4

### CARRIED

#### 12. Other Business

89-3M-6 It was moved and seconded (Fazio/Maguire) that the courses scheduled in the 1445-1600 time slot be changed to 1440-1555.

Vice-Dean Ruby asked if this time slot only involved Arts and Science courses, or if we were interfering with other Faculties. The Dean responded that the motion would go to Senate.

Vice-Dean Dicks commented that this was a very complex issue, and that the suggested solution was probably the least troublesome.

White wondered if, by decreasing the time available for travel from the previous time slot to the new one, Council would cause other problems.

The Dean suggested that since this change could not be implemented until 1990-91, it should go back to the Steering Committee for further consideration and be returned to Council in September.

Fazio and Maguire withdrew the motion on the understanding that a solution would be forthcoming.

#### 13. Next Meeting

The next meeting of Council will be held on Friday, May 12, 1989, at 1330 hours, in AD-131.

#### 14. Adjournment

89-3M-7 It was moved and seconded (Barlow/Schmid) that the meeting be adjourned at 1544.